

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

CTP INNOVATIONS, LLC	§	
v.	§	Case No. 2:13-CV-484-JRG-RSP
	§	LEAD CASE
INTEGRACOLOR	§	

---

CTP INNOVATIONS, LLC	§	
v.	§	Case No. 2:13-CV-485-JRG-RSP
	§	
PERFORMANCE COMPANIES, LP	§	

---

CTP INNOVATIONS, LLC	§	
v.	§	Case No. 2:13-CV-486-JRG-RSP
	§	
BEST PRESS, INC.	§	

---

CTP INNOVATIONS, LLC	§	
v.	§	Case No. 2:13-CV-487-JRG-RSP
	§	
OVATION GRAPHICS, LLC, ET AL.	§	

---

CTP INNOVATIONS, LLC	§	
v.	§	Case No. 2:13-CV-488-JRG-RSP
	§	
NIEMAN PRINTING	§	

---

CTP INNOVATIONS, LLC	§	
v.	§	Case No. 2:13-CV-489-JRG-RSP
	§	
TST/IMPRESO, INC.	§	

---

CTP INNOVATIONS, LLC	§	
v.	§	Case No. 2:13-CV-490-JRG-RSP
	§	
IMAGINE! PRINT SOLUTIONS, INC.	§	

---

CTP INNOVATIONS, LLC	§	
v.	§	
	§	Case No. 2:13-CV-491-JRG-RSP
BLANKS PRINTING & IMAGING, INC.	§	

---

CTP INNOVATIONS, LLC	§	
v.	§	
	§	Case No. 2:13-CV-492-JRG-RSP
PRINTPLACE.COM	§	

---

CTP INNOVATIONS, LLC	§	
v.	§	
	§	Case No. 2:13-CV-493-JRG-RSP
ETHERIDGE PRINTING	§	

---

CTP INNOVATIONS, LLC	§	
v.	§	
	§	Case No. 2:13-CV-495-JRG-RSP
O'NEIL DATA SYSTEMS, INC.	§	

---

CTP INNOVATIONS, LLC	§	
v.	§	
	§	Case No. 2:13-CV-496-JRG-RSP
COCKRELL ENOVATION, INC., ET AL.	§	

---

CTP INNOVATIONS, LLC	§	
v.	§	
	§	Case No. 2:13-CV-516-JRG-RSP
XPRESSDOCS GP, LLC	§	

---

**ORDER REGARDING JOINT MOTIONS TO STAY**

Before the Court are the parties' Joint Motions to Stay Case Pending Determination of Inter Partes Review Proceedings. The Court notes that nearly identical motions have been filed in each of the above-captioned cases. Despite the Court having expended a great deal of judicial

resources becoming familiar with the patents in question, the Court agrees with the parties' joint request to stay this action pending Inter Partes Review ("IPR"). Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** the parties' request to stay this action and **ORDERS** that this action be stayed for a period of six months. The parties are also **ORDERED** to submit a joint status report to the Court no later than April 9, 2014, setting forth: the status of the IPR, any action taken by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board up to that date, and the parties' positions regarding whether the stay should continue and if so, the length of additional time appropriate for a continued stay. In view of this stay, the Court **DENIES** without prejudice the Defendants' Motions to Transfer Venue.

**SIGNED this 11th day of October, 2013.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ROY S. PAYNE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE